

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13-18 and 20-36 are currently pending. Claims 1, 20, 24, 28, 32, 35 and 36 are currently amended. Claims 8, 11-12, 19, 21 and 29 are currently cancelled.

Applicants have ordered a certified copy of the foreign priority application filed in Europe and will mail the certified copy to the Examiner promptly upon arrival.

Claims 9, 13-15, 24, 32 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the office action mentions that it is unclear whether claims 9 and 36 are directed towards a polyamine derivative or a process of reacting a polyamine with an amine modifier. Both claims 9 and 36 are directed towards a polyamine derivative. The polyamine derivative of claims 9 and 36 contain a functional group that is the product of reagent L reacted with an amine modifier when index s represents an integer of 1 to 10.

Applicants have additionally amended claims 24, 28, and 32 to correct the antecedent basis problems.

Applicants have also corrected the dependency of claim 35.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 10, 16-18 and 36 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schipfer et al. (US 4,563,515). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 36 teach the one or more amine-specific reagents having a fourth number of two or more amine-specific functional groups selected from the group consisting of isocyanate groups, anhydride groups, acid chloride groups, maleate groups, fumarate groups, citraconic ester groups, itaconic ester groups, and (meth)acrylate groups.

The Examiner has not pointed to a teaching or suggestion in Schipfer et al. of a process that would produce a polyamine derivative meeting the foregoing limitation.

Specifically, the office action states that Schipfer et al. teach a process of reacting a polyamine having primary and secondary amine groups with hydroxyl carboxylic acid or lactone to form a product, which is then reacted with an epoxy resin and an amine modifier. The office action additionally states that Schipfer et al. disclose a further step wherein the intermediate product is reacted with polycaprolactone which would inherently attach a matrix compatible moiety to form a polyamine derivative.

The secondary amine groups of Schipfer et al. disclosed on column 5 and 6, do not teach or suggest applicants' amended claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection in light of applicants' amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22-23, 25, 28, 30-31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Honig et al, (US 5,369,190). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 20 and 28 to include the amine modifier of claims 21 and 29.

Honig et al. do not teach or suggest applicants' process for preparing a polyamine derivative that involves reacting one or more polyamines to form a polyamide derived

compound, reacting the polyamine-derived compound with one or more amine-specific reagents, and further reacting the polyamine-derived compound with an amine modifier.

Specifically, the office action states that Honig et al. disclose a process comprising reacting polyamine with cyclic carbonate to form a polyamine derived compound which is then reacted with diisocyanate to form an intermediate product. However, the office action concludes that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Honig et al. that teaches an amine modifier, as required in applicants' present claims 21 and 29.

Withdrawal of the rejection in light of applicants' amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Honig et al. (US 5,369,190).

Honig et al. do not teach or suggest applicants' polyamine derivative that requires the reaction of reacting a polyamine-derived compound with an amine modifier.

Specifically, the office action states that Honig et al. disclose a process comprising reacting polyamine with cyclic carbonate to form a polyamine derived compound which is then reacted with diisocyanate to form an intermediate product. However, the office action concludes that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Honig et al., that teaches an amine modifier, as required in applicants' present claim 9.

Withdrawal of the rejection in light of applicants' claims is respectfully requested.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

U.S.S.N. 10/687,766

Response to Office Action mailed May 17, 2007

If it would be of assistance with this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Yuen  
L0278

Date: 9/17/07

Hexion Specialty Chemicals, Inc.  
1600 Smith Street 24<sup>th</sup> Floor, P.O. Box 4500  
Houston, Texas 77210-4500

Direct Phone: (832) 366-2475  
Direct Facsimile: (281) 205-2050  
[richard.yuen@hexion.com](mailto:richard.yuen@hexion.com)